



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,221	09/28/2001	James Morrow	83336.0519	7155
66880 7590 04/13/2009 STEPTOE & JOHNSON, LLP 2121 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 2800 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067				
EXAMINER				
THOMAS, ERIC M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/13/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kstowe@steptoe.com
emiyake@steptoe.com
jpcody@ballytech.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/967,221

Applicant(s)

MORROW ET AL.

Examiner

Eric M. Thomas

Art Unit

3714

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is in response to the amendments filed on 9/9/08. Claims 1 – 138 are pending in the current application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 - 138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (US 5,429,361) in view of Kaminkow (U.S. 2003/0032474).

Regarding Claims 1, 16 - 18, 26, 41-44, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has a display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine. Raven et al. lacks explicitly disclosing; integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming platform screen used to display the gaming information. Raven et al. discloses one way a player or employee interacts with the system is by

pressing buttons on a keypad, whereas, in the instant invention, a touch-screen input is utilized to interface with the system. Interaction with a gaming system, whether by keypad input or touch-screen, provides the same function to the overall system. Even though, it was notoriously well known to use touch-screen technology in gaming machines at the time of applicant's invention, Raven is silent on the issue of gaming interface that allows a player to view and participate in the wagering through the display screen and whether the gaming machine produces enhanced graphics and animation display for interactions with the system network. In a related art, however, Kaminkow provides a gaming machine wherein the game player may select goods and services items from a prize menu using an input mechanism, wherein the menu may be displayed on a touch screen and the player may touch the screen to select one of the goods and services items (par. 0095). The examiner views this as a systems interface that incorporated into the display screen of the gaming platform, wherein the systems interface displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming machine to a casino player or employee, wherein the system interface may be operable to produce system request capabilities. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Kaminkow into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding claims 2, 19, 45, 86, 103 – 105, 115, 117, 121, and 122, Raven provides a gaming system wherein the player inserts a card into a card of the gaming machine wherein the gaming will prompt the player by means on the display to enter his/her pin number via a keypad, (col. 10, lines 47 - 53). The examiner views this as an identification card that may have embedded information, wherein once the player inserts the card into the gaming machine it activates the systems interface on the display screen.

Regarding claims 3 – 5, 22 – 24, 34 – 37, 46, and 48 – 50, 61, 63, 64, 72, 73, 94, 96, 97, 118, and 120, Raven provides a gaming system that discloses a control unit that includes a card reader and employee/player communications are desired (col. 2, lines 29 - 36). This is viewed by the examiner as the gaming system having an interface system that includes player and employee services that is accessible by an identification card inserted into the gaming device, wherein the employee may use to access the MASTERCOM control unit of the gaming system that may include game information, game monitoring, and account meters.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor. One would be motivated to utilize a Y adapter to allow communication between the display and one of the processors because a Y

adapter provides a simple solution to switching communication from one processor to the other, thereby, allowing the system to eliminate at least one redundant connection between the display and one of the processors.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the art.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116, Raven discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines, but Raven is silent on the issue of gaming interface that allows a player to view and participate in the wagering through the display screen and whether the gaming machine produces enhanced graphics and animation display for interactions with the system network. As stated above, however, Kaminkow provides a gaming machine wherein the game player may select goods and services items from a prize menu using an input mechanism, wherein the menu may be displayed on a touch screen and the player may touch the screen to select one of the goods and services items (par. 0095). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Kaminkow into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding claims 9, 25, 32, 33, 51 – 53, 59, 60, 93, 107, 123, 124, 131, and 132, Raven provides a gaming system that includes a control unit called MASTERCOM, a DMK unit, and a main computer, wherein these elements are the primary hardware elements of the gaming system, wherein the term MASTERCOM is derived from its functions: Maintenance, Accounting, Security, player Tracking, Event Recorder, and Communicator, wherein the DMK unit is the interface and communications device between a player or employee and the MASTERCOM, wherein both of these elements are controlled by a processor, wherein the system also includes an EEPROM that is used for storing accounting meters, wherein the information stored may be a list of parameters containing addresses, coin denomination, limits and other characteristics that vary from one gaming machine and/or casino to another (col. 2, line 29 —col. 3, line 20). This is viewed by the examiner as the gaming system utilizing a multiple processor platform, wherein at least one processor supports the hardware applications, wherein at least one processor runs game controlling peripherals, game logic, and rules necessary to generate a wagering game on the display of the gaming device, and at least one processor that provides access to system information on a system network via the systems interface.

Regarding claims 10 – 15, 21, 27 – 31, 39, 47, 54 – 58, 71, 76 - 82, 85, 87 - 92, 106, 108 – 113, 116, 119, 125 – 130, Raven provides a gaming system that includes a display and input system, but is silent on the issue of the gaming including a touch screen. As stated above, however, Kaminkow provides a gaming machine wherein the game player may select goods and services items from a prize menu using an input

mechanism, wherein the menu may be displayed on a touch screen and the player may touch the screen to select one of the goods and services items (par. 0095). The examiner views the touch screen of Kaminkow as being capable of having a small region that is selectable by a user that may show messages to the user once the user touches the screen to select one of the goods and services. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine the teachings of Kaminkow into the art disclosed by Raven in order to provide a transaction system utilizing touch-screen technology into the wagering game, which is attractive to game players and casino personnel and requires less maintenance than mechanical push buttons.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts. Reducing overall costs by eliminating hardware and reducing maintenance costs are a byproduct of modernizing an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding claims 62, 95, and 133, Raven provides a gaming system that may include a network interface card (col. 2, lines 44 - 46).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argue that the examiner's assertion of the claimed elements of "a gaming interface incorporated within the display screen of the gaming platform, wherein the gaming interface enables a player to view a wagering game through the display

screen and participate in the wagering game through the display screen" and "a systems interface incorporated into the display screen of the gaming platform, wherein the systems interface displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform to a casino player or employee via the gaming interface display screen of the gaming platform", is well known at the time the invention was made, is completely unsupported by the art of record, wherein the Examiner has not provided any supported references which teach or suggest that the above claimed elements are well-known, and an Examiner cannot maintain a rejection based on based on common knowledge without any supporting references. With respect to claims 1 - 138, this argument has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kaminkow (U.S. 2003/0032474), which is used as a supporting reference as meeting this claim limitation.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric M. Thomas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1699. The examiner can normally be reached on 7a.m. - 3p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hotaling can be reached on (571) 272-4437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John M Hotaling II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714